

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 15, 19, and 23 were amended. Accordingly, claims 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10, 12-15 and 17-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite "a door of a vehicle" in the preamble to provide proper antecedent basis for subsequent references to "the vehicle". Claim 12 has been amended to cite "the interior of the vehicle" referring to the interior introduced in claim 10. Further, claim 20 has been amended to remove the typographical error in line 3. Accordingly, Applicants contend the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are now moot and respectfully request their withdrawal thereof.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over German Patent Publication No. 195 09 282 in view of Renner et al. ("Renner").

The present invention is a component support assembly that includes a rigid double shell box structure. The box structure has a first wall adjacent or facing the interior of the vehicle and a second wall positioned or facing toward the exterior of the vehicle. Claims 10, 15, 20 and 23 provides a plurality of vehicle door components mounted to said first wall. The vehicle door components being mounted to the first wall provides benefits relative to modularity and manufacturability.

With regard to GP '282, the Examiner contends the first inner wall corresponds to 5a and the second outer wall corresponds to 3. Further, the Examiner notes "vehicle door components 4, 90 and 91 are mounted to the *second wall*". GP '282 does not teach or suggest vehicle door components mounted to the *first wall* as claimed. Therefore, GP '282 is directly cotary to and does not teach or suggest the present invention.

In addition, Renner does not teach or suggest vehicle components mounted to the first wall. For at least the reasons mentioned above, claims 10, 15, 19, and 23 are patentable over GP '282 in view of Renner.

With respect to claims 12, 14, 17, 18-21, 24, 25, 27, and 28, Applicants contend that these claims are also patentable over GP '282 in view of Renner. Claims 12, 14, 17, 18-21, 24, 25, 27, and 28 ultimately depend directly or indirectly from claims 10, 15, 19, or 23 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons given above in support of claims 10, 15, 19, or 23.

Claims 13, 18, 22 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GP '282 in view of Renner as applied to claims 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 above, and further in view of Finch et al ("Finch").

Finch does not teach or suggest vehicle door components mounted to the first inner wall as claimed. Therefore, Finch does not teach or suggest the present invention. Accordingly, GP '282 in view of Renner and Finch cannot render the claims 13, 18, 22 and 27 unpatentable for at least the reasons mentioned above in support of claims 10, 15, 19, and 23. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Dated: 9/22/03

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(734) 302-6000

Respectfully submitted by,

Robert K. Fergan
Robert K. Fergan
Reg. No.: 51,674
Attorney for Applicant(s)

OFFICIAL

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 23 2003